

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1-10 and 12 have been amended to clarify features of the claimed invention and to further distinguish the claimed invention from the references identified in the rejection below.

Support for these amendments can be found, at least, in Figs 2 and 7 of the present application.

II. Objections to the Claims

Claims 1 and 3-7 were objected to for reciting “operable to,” which is allegedly language that merely suggests or makes optional. Claims 1 and 3-7 have been amended to replace the phrase “operable to” with active language that requires a specific structure. As a result, withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-9, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of Deeds, Demsky and Emerson, III. These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1, 10 and 12 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a communication terminal for communicating with a first communication terminal. Claim 1 recites that the communication terminal includes a

communication section receiving, from the first communication terminal, personal information of the first communication terminal and a presentation attribute that indicates whether a presentation of the personal information of the first communication terminal to a second communication terminal is permitted. In addition, claim 1 recites that the communication terminal includes a personal information presentation section presenting, to the second communication terminal, via the communication section, only personal information of the first communication terminal that has been determined by a personal information determination section to be permitted to be presented to the second communication terminal, the personal information presented to the second communication terminal having been acquired from the first communication terminal.

Based on the above-described structure required by claim 1, it is apparent that the communication terminal receives, from a first terminal, personal information (of the first terminal) and a presentation attribute that indicates whether a presentation of the personal information of the first terminal to a second terminal is permitted, such that a communication section of the communication terminal presents only the personal information of the first terminal to the second terminal that has been determined to be permitted to be presented (i.e., the communication terminal is restricted from presenting the personal information of the first terminal to the second terminal, unless the presentation information indicates that such a presentation to the second terminal is permitted).

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections acknowledge that Deeds fails to disclose or suggest the features of the claimed presentation attribute and the operations of the communication terminal associated therewith, as previously recited in claim 1. In light of the above, the rejection of claim 1 relies on Demsky for teaching the above-mentioned

features which are admittedly lacking from Deeds. However, in view of the above-mentioned amendments to claim 1, it is submitted that Demsky also fails to disclose or suggest the features of the claimed invention that are admittedly lacking from Deeds.

Rather, Demsky merely teaches, based on content rules, restricting on a terminal-by-terminal basis the viewing of information transmitted from the source of the information (see Figs. 2 and 3, and col. 7, lines 4, 5, 18-23 and 30-35). More specifically, according to Demsky, when information is presented from a source terminal to other terminals, the disclosure of the information for each “other” terminal is restricted on a terminal-by-terminal basis.

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Demsky teaches that when information is transmitted from a source terminal to other terminals, the viewing of the information is restricted on a terminal-by-terminal basis, but fails to disclose or suggest that the first terminal transmits, to the communication terminal, the personal information of the first terminal and the presentation attribute (indicating whether a presentation of the personal information of the first terminal to a second terminal is permitted) and fails to disclose or suggest that the communication terminal presents only the personal information of the first terminal to the second terminal that has been determined to be permitted to be presented, as required by claim 1.

In addition, although Demsky teaches the use of “content rules” which prohibit the transfer of information from the source terminal to other viewing terminals on a terminal-by-terminal basis, Demsky still fails to disclose or suggest the “presentation attribute” that indicates whether a presentation from the communication terminal, of the personal information of the first terminal, to the second terminal, as recited in claim 1.

In other words, Demsky does not provide a structure that restricts the presentation/transfer of information of the first (source terminal), sent from a first (source) terminal, from the communication terminal to the second terminal.

Put another way, Demsky's disclosure of restricting the transfer of information from a source terminal to other terminals on a terminal-by-terminal basis is not a disclosure or suggestion the communication terminal receiving, from a first terminal, (i) personal information (of the first terminal), and (ii) a presentation attribute that indicates whether a presentation of the personal information of the first terminal to a second terminal is permitted, such that a communication section of the communication terminal presents only the personal information of the first terminal to the second terminal that has been determined to be permitted to be presented (i.e., the communication terminal is restricted from presenting the personal information of the first terminal to the second terminal, unless the presentation information indicates that such a presentation to the second terminal is permitted), as required by claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 1 and claims 2-9 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Deeds and Demsky.

Regarding dependent claim 8, which was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deeds and Demsky in view of Emerson (secondary reference), it is respectfully submitted that this secondary reference does not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claim 1 which are lacking from the Deeds and Demsky references. Therefore, no obvious combination of Deeds and Demsky with any the secondary reference would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Deeds, Demsky and/or Emerson or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Deeds, Demsky and/or Emerson to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 2-9 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claims 10 and 12 are directed to a method and a program, respectively and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 10 and 12 are allowable over referenced prior art.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Kazuyuki KASHIWABARA
/Andrew L. Dunlap/
By 2010.01.13 13:11:04 -05'00'
Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
January 13, 2010